arXiv:1703.05426v1 [quant-ph] 15 Mar 2017

Parallel Device-Independent Quantum Key Distribution

Rahul Jain, National University of Singapore
Carl A. Miller, National Institute of Standards and Technology
and University of Maryland, College Park
Yaoyun Shi, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Abstract

A prominent application of quantum cryptography is the distribution of cryptographic keys with unconditional security. Recently, such security was extended by Vazirani and Vidick (*Physical Review Letters*, 113, 140501, 2014) to the device-independent (DI) scenario, where the users do not need to trust the integrity of the underlying quantum devices. The protocols analyzed by them and by subsequent authors all require a sequential execution of N multiplayer games, where N is the security parameter. In this work, we prove unconditional security of a protocol where all games are executed in parallel. Our result further reduces the requirements for QKD (allowing for arbitrary information leakage within each players' lab) and opens the door to more efficient implementation. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first parallel security proof for a fully device-independent QKD protocol. Our protocol tolerates a constant level of device imprecision and achieves a linear key rate.

1 Introduction

Key Distribution (KD) is the task for two parties to establish a common secret by communicating through a public channel. It is a necessary step to apply symmetric key cryptography (i.e., protocols that require a shared secret) in the practical setting when a secure communication channel is initially not available. Thus KD is a primitive foundational to information security.

Information theoretically secure KD is impossible for classical protocols (i.e., protocols that exchange bits). Thus all classical solutions must necessarily rely on computational assumptions. Widely used protocols, such as the Diffie-Hellman key exchange protocol [10] and those making use of digital signatures (e.g., as in the implementation of Secure Sockets Layer) all rely on the computational security of public key cryptography. The hardness assumptions underlying all known public key cryptography are mathematically unproven. The practical security of these solutions are being challenged on the one hand by the rapidly increasing and widely available high performance computing power, and on the other hand, by new insights into the design flaws. For example, Adrian *et al.* [1] recently showed how Diffie-Hellman fails in practice. A further threat to all widely used public-key-based KD protocols is that they are not secure against quantum cryptanalysis. With universal quantum computer within sight [9] and quantum-resilient protocols yet to emerge, these challenges call for alternative and fundamentally more secure solutions for KD.

Quantum mechanics provides such a solution. The quantum key distribution (QKD) protocol of Bennett and Brassard [5] and its several subsequent variants have been proved to be unconditionally secure (i.e., against a computationally all-powerful adversary) [18, 17, 26, 24, 4]. Experimental networks implementing QKD have been developed and deployed with increasingly large scales. With the rapid advances of quantum information technologies, QKD protocols may be widely adopted in the near future.

A major challenge for QKD (and other quantum information tasks) is that quantum information is extremely fragile. How could a user of a QKD protocol be sure that the quantum devices are operating according to the specifications? This consideration motivates the field of device-independent (DI) quantum cryptography, pioneered by Mayers and Yao [19]. The goal of DI quantum cryptography is to develop protocols and prove security in a strictly black-box fashion, with the only trusted assumption being that quantum physics is correct and complete, and that the users have the ability to restrict information transmission. The field has seen enormous success in recent years, including in fully device-independent security proofs for QKD [29, 21, 2, 11].

All the known secure DI QKD protocols are *sequential* in the following sense. Alice and Bob share a two-part quantum device $D = (D_1, D_2)$, each of which is treated as a black box which accepts classical inputs and returns classical outputs. Alice creates a random input X_1, gives it to her device D_1, and receives an output A_1. Meanwhile, Bob gives a random input Y_1 to his device D_2 and receives an output B_1. This process is repeated sequentially N times to obtain $X_1, \ldots, X_N, Y_1, \ldots, Y_N, A_1, \ldots, A_N, B_1, \ldots, B_N$. (These data are then used to determine whether the protocol "succeeds" or "aborts", and in the former case, these registers are the postprocessed by Alice and Bob to obtain their final shared key.) The sequential assumption means specifically that output A_i is recorded before the device gains knowledge of X_{i+1}. Would security still hold if all X_i's were given to the device at once?

The parallel problem is a natural one, and also opens the door to more efficient protocols. Removing the need to satisfy the sequential constraint may lead to faster key generation.

A second motivation is the security of the inputs in the protocol. To see why this is relevant, we note that the natural way of enforcing the sequential assumption is to randomly generate the input

X_{i+1} after A_i has been recorded. For example, in the recent loophole-free Bell tests [14, 25, 13], each of the inputs X_{i+1} is created by a quantum random number generator shortly before measurement, and is thus unknown to either device in previous rounds. However, this approach assumes the high quality of the quantum random number generator, which in the device-independent setting is an assumption that we wish to avoid. Alternatively, we can assume that (X_i) has been generated in advance (perhaps through device-independent randomness expansion [8]) and protected from an advance influence on Alice's device D_1. This assumption, though, is at least inconvenient, since it is known to be hard to secure digital information over short distances (see, e.g., [12]). The parallel setting allows advance generation of the input settings and also arbitrary leakage between components of either Alice's or Bob's labs.

In this parallel setting, Alice's and Bob's devices are prevented from communicating with one another once the protocol starts (since otherwise they could broadcast all of their inputs immediately). Fortunately this restriction is not too limiting: if the devices need to refresh their entanglement while the protocol is underway, the entanglement can be broadcast from a third (also untrusted) device outside of Alice's and Bob's labs.

We will prove quantum key distribution based only on the following trusted assumptions:

1. Quantum physics is correct and complete.
2. Alice and Bob both have access to uniform (private) randomness.
3. Alice and Bob have the ability to block information transmission from (although not necessarily within) their own labs.

We also prove a (non-explicit) constant level of noise tolerance and positive linear rate for MagicQKD.

1.1 The protocol and technical statements

All DI protocols use *nonlocal games* as building blocks. For our protocol, we use the Magic Square game.

Definition 1.1. *The Magic Square game (MSG) is a two-player game in which the input alphabet for both players is $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = \{1, 2, 3\}$, the output alphabet for the first player is $\mathcal{A} = \{000, 011, 101, 110\}$ (the set of all 3 bit strings of even parity), and the output alphabet for the second player is $\mathcal{B} = \{001, 010, 100, 111\}$ (the set of all 3 bit strings of odd parity). The inputs are chosen according to a uniform distribution, and the game is won if the inputs x, y and the outputs a, b satisfy $a_y = b_x$.*

The Magic Square game has optimal quantum winning probability 1 and optimal classical winning probability 8/9.

Our parallel DI QKD protocol, *MagicQKD*, is given in Figure 1. (All figures appear at the end of this document.) Alice and Bob are the parties who wish to share a key, and Eve is an adversary. It is a assumed that the untrusted devices (D_1, D_2) are initially in a pure state with Eve's side information E (which is the worst-case scenario) and that Eve has access to any communications between Alice and Bob during the protocol. The security parameter N is the number of instances of Magic Square played. The parameter ϵ is a positive rational number. In our proof we show that there is some fixed positive value $\epsilon := \epsilon_0$ such that the protocol achieves a positive linear rate of key distribution as N tends to infinity.

Let $AliceKey$ denote the raw key $R_1, \ldots, R_{\epsilon N}$ possessed by Alice at the end of the protcol MagicQKD, let $BobKey$ denote the raw key $S_1, \ldots, S_{\epsilon N}$ possessed by Bob, and let Eve denote all information possessed by Alice at the conclusion of the protocol (including her side information E and any information obtained by eavesdropping). The smooth min-entropy $H_{min}^{\delta}(AliceKey \mid Eve)$ measures the number of uniformly random bits that can be extracted from AliceKey in Eve's presence, while the smooth zero min-entropy $H_0^{\delta}(AliceKey \mid BobKey)$ measures the least number of bits that Alice needs to send to Bob in order for him to perfectly reconstruct $AliceKey$. To show security for a quantum key distribution protocol, it suffices to show that the former quantity is greater than the latter by some function that is linear in N. Once this is accomplished, standard techniques allow Alice and Bob to compute a uniformly random shared key with negligible error. (See Chapters 5 and 6 of [24] for formal explanations of these techniques. Note that the author of [24] uses the notation H_{max} instead of H_0.)

Let $SUCC$ denote the event that the protocol succeeds. Our main result is the following (see Theorem 5.5).

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\delta = 4\exp(-\epsilon^3 N)$. The final state Γ of MagicQKD satisfies*

$$H_{min}^{\delta}(AliceKey \mid Eve)_{SUCC} - H_0^{\delta}(AliceKey \mid BobKey)_{SUCC} \quad \geq \quad \epsilon N[0.01 - O(\sqrt{\epsilon})].$$

If we fix $\epsilon := \epsilon_0$ to be small enough that the function represented by $O(\sqrt{\epsilon})$ is strictly less than 0.01, we obtain a linear key rate (for arbitrarily large N) and an exponentially vanishing error term δ. The protocol also permits a constant level of noise. (Any device whose expected score on the Magic Square game is bounded above $1 - \epsilon_0$ will always succeed at MagicQKD, except with probability exponentially vanishing in N.)

1.2 Proof techniques

The main insight in our proof is a reduction of the security for MagicQKD to a parallel repetition problem for a 6-player game (see Figure 4). This reduction has a number of subtleties, and involves a hybridization of parallel repetition techniques with techniques from (sequential) device-independent quantum cryptography.

The central challenge when moving from the sequential setting to the parallel setting is the possibility of new correlations in the behavior of D_1 and D_2 on separate games. These correlations can have counter-intuitive properties: for example, Fortnow gave an example of a two-player game G such that $w_c(G^2) > w_c(G)^2$, where w_c denotes the optimal score for classical players and G^2 denotes the game G repeated twice in parallel (see Appendix A in [15]). The same could not be true in the sequential setting – the optimal score for G repeated twice in sequence must be exactly $w_c(G)^2$. Thus the parallel assumption opens up new demands for cheating and requires new techniques.

A technique that has been highly successful for the parallel repetition problem (i.e., for constraining the behavior of untrusted players at N-fold parallel repeated games) is based on bounding the amount of information (measured by von Neumann entropy) that players learn about one another's inputs when we condition on events that depend on a limited number of other games [23]. This technique was brought into the quantum context in [6, 16, 7, 3], and allows the proofs of exponentially vanishing upper bounds for $w_q(G^N)$ for certain broad classes of games.

We have found a connection by which these parallel repetition results can be used to obtain lower bounds on entropy in the presence of quantum side information. Specifically, we

show that the collision entropy $H_2(\text{AliceKey}, \text{BobKey} \mid \text{Eve})$ (which is asymptotically the same as $H^{\epsilon}_{min}(\text{AliceKey}, \text{BobKey} \mid \text{Eve})$) is can be expressed in terms of the winning probability of the "doubled" version of the Magic Square game in Figure 4. In this expanded game, players try to win the Magic Square game while also trying to guess one another's inputs and outputs. With this game, we are able to reduce the security claim to a parallel repetition problem, which we then prove by a modification of the techniques from [6, 16, 7, 3].

We also make use of a technique from sequential device-independent quantum cryptography (introduced in our previous work [21], also used in [11]): each time players who are generating random numbers fail at a single instance of a game, we introduce additional artificial randomness to compensate for the failure (here represented by the register T in Figure 5). This artificial randomness (which is useful for induction) is used only for intermediate steps in the proof and is removed before the final security claim. This aspect of the proof is important for proving noise tolerance in MagicQKD.

For the above approach to produce a positive key rate, we have made use of the following properties of the Magic Square game: (1) it is perfectly winnable by a quantum strategy, (2) its input distribution is uniform, and (3) an honest strategy under a sufficiently small noise must have a linear amount of min-entropy left after the inputs are revealed. Consequently, when the noise level tends to 0, this residual min-entropy stays above a linear amount, while the communication cost for information reconciliation tends to 0, and this is what enables our proof of a positive key rate.

Explicit calculations of the noise tolerance and key rate for MagicQKD are left as topics for further work. A worthwhile avenue is to explore how adjustments to the parameters (including the choice of game) could optimize these quantities.

Section 2 establishes notation for our proofs. Section 3 provides the basis for our interpretation of collision entropy as the winning probability of a "doubled" game. Section 4 defines the doubled Magic Square game and proves an upper bound on its winning probability. Section 5 gives the the proof of the central security claims. The appendix proves the necessary parallel repetition result and also some supporting lemmas.

2 Notation

Some of the notation in this section is based on [27]. If T is a finite set, let $\text{Perm}(T)$ denote the set of permutations of T. If $t \in T$, then we write can $T \setminus \{t\}$ to denote the complement of t, or if the set T is understood from the context, we simply write $\widehat{t}$ for $T \setminus \{t\}$. We use similar notation $\widehat{U}$ to denote the complement of a subset $U \subseteq T$.

Let $\mathcal{D}(T)$ denote the set of probability distributions on the finite set T, and let $\mathcal{S}(T)$ denote the set of subnormalized probability distributions. If $p, q \in \mathcal{S}(T)$ are subnormalized distributions let

$$\Delta(p,q) \quad = \quad \sum_{t \in T} |p(t) - q(t)| + |x - y| \tag{1}$$

where $x := \sum_{t \in T} p(t)$ and $y := \sum_{t \in T} q(t)$ respectively. The function Δ is a metric on $\mathcal{S}(T)$.

If $x_1, \ldots, x_N$ and $y_1, \ldots, y_N$ are binary sequences, let $\text{Ham}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ denote the Hamming distance between $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$.

2.1 Quantum states and operations

A *quantum register* (or simply *register*) is a finite-dimensional complex Hilbert space. We use Roman letters (e.g., B) to denote quantum registers. Given two quantum registers Q, Q', we will sometimes write QQ' for the tensor product $Q \otimes Q'$.

If $\mathcal{S}$ is a finite set, an *$\mathcal{S}$-valued quantum register* is quantum register that has a fixed isomorphism with $\mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{S}}$. If Q is a quantum register, let $\mathcal{L}(Q), \mathcal{H}(Q), \mathcal{P}(Q), \mathcal{S}(Q)$, and $\mathcal{D}(Q)$, denote, respectively, the sets of linear, Hermitian, positive semidefinite, subnormalized positive semidefinite (trace ≤ 1) and normalized positive semidefinite operators on Q. A *state* of Q is an element of $\mathcal{D}(Q)$. Elements of $\mathcal{S}(Q)$ are referred to as *subnormalized states* of Q. A *reflection* is a Hermitian operator whose eigenvalues are contained in $\{-1, 1\}$.

For any quantum register Q, the symbol I^Q denotes the identity operator on I, and U^Q denotes the completely mixed state $I^Q/(\dim(Q))$.

If Q, Q' are quantum registers, the set $\mathcal{L}(Q)$ has a natural embedding into $\mathcal{L}(Q \otimes Q')$ by tensoring with $I_{Q'}$. We use this embedding implicitly: if $T \in \mathcal{L}(Q)$ and $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(Q \otimes Q')$, then $T(\Phi)$ denotes $(T \otimes I_{Q'})\Phi$.

A *copy* of a register Q is a register Q' with the same dimension with a fixed isomorphism $Q' \cong Q$. If $\Gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\Gamma)$ is a state, then a *canonical purification* of Γ is a pure state $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}(Q \otimes Q')$, where Q' is a copy of Q, such that $\Gamma = \Phi^Q = \Phi^{Q'}$ under the fixed isomorphism $Q \cong Q'$.

A *measurement* on a register Q is an indexed set $\{M_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(Q)$ which sums to the identity. A *measurement strategy* on Q is a collection of measurements on Q that all have the same index set.

We will use lower case Greek letters (e.g., γ) to denote complex vectors, and either uppercase Greek letters (e.g., Γ) or Roman letters to denote Hermitian operators on finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces. If Γ is a Hermitian operator on a tensor product space $W \otimes V$, then Γ^V denotes the operator

$$\Gamma^V \quad := \quad \mathrm{Tr}_W \Gamma. \tag{2}$$

Alternatively we may write $\Gamma^{\widehat{W}}$ for $\mathrm{Tr}_W \Gamma$. If T is a projector on W, let

$$\Gamma_T \quad = \quad (I \otimes T)\Gamma(I \otimes T) \tag{3}$$

and if $\mathrm{Tr}(\Gamma_T) \neq 0$, let $\Gamma_{|T} = \Gamma_T / \mathrm{Tr}(\Gamma_T)$.

If Φ is a positive semidefinite operator, then Φ^r denotes the operator that arises from applying the function

$$f(x) \quad = \quad \begin{cases} x^r & \text{if } x > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } x = 0. \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

to the eigenvalues of Φ.

We make free use of the following shorthands. If $x_1, \ldots, x_N$ is a sequence, then the boldface letter $\mathbf{x}$ denotes $(x_1, \ldots, x_N)$. If $X_1, \ldots, X_N$ are quantum registers, then X denotes $X_1 X_2 \cdots X_N$. We write $X_{i \ldots j}$ for the registers $X_i X_{i+1} \cdots X_j$. If $\{Y_i^j\}$ is an array of registers, then $Y_i = \{Y_i^j\}_j$ and $Y^j = \{Y_i^j\}_i$. The expression $X_{\hat{i}}$ denotes the sequence $X_1 \ldots, X_{i-1}, X_{i+1}, \ldots, X_N$. If Γ is a state of $X_1 \ldots X_N$, we may write either $\Gamma^{X_{\hat{i}}}$ or $\Gamma^{\widehat{X_i}}$ to denote $\Gamma^{X_1 \cdots X_{i-1} X_{i+1} \cdots X_N}$.

2.2 Distance measures

If $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \in \mathcal{D}(Q)$ for some quantum register Q, let

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) &= \frac{1}{2} \|\Gamma_1 - \Gamma_2\|_1 && (5) \\ F(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) &= \left\| \sqrt{\Gamma_1}\sqrt{\Gamma_2} \right\|_1 && (6) \\ P(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) &= \sqrt{1 - F(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)^2}. && (7) \end{aligned}$$

For $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \in \mathcal{S}(Q)$, let $[\Lambda_i]$ denote the density operator[1] $\Lambda_i \oplus (1 - \mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda_i))$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) &= \Delta([\Lambda_1], [\Lambda_2]) && (8) \\ F(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) &= F([\Lambda_1], [\Lambda_2]) && (9) \\ P(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) &= P([\Lambda_1], [\Lambda_2\rangle) && (10) \end{aligned}$$

The functions P (purified distance) and Δ (generalized trace distance) are metrics on $\mathcal{S}(Q)$, and $\Delta \leq P \leq \sqrt{2\Delta}$. Both quantities P and Δ satisfy data processing inequalities. (See Chapter 3 in [27]).

2.3 Games

An *n-player nonlocal game* G with input alphabets $\mathcal{X}^1, \ldots, \mathcal{X}^n$ and output alphabets $\mathcal{A}^1, \ldots, \mathcal{A}^n$ is a probability distribution

$$p\colon \prod_i \mathcal{X}^i \to [0, 1] \tag{11}$$

together with a predicate

$$L\colon \prod_i \mathcal{X}^i \times \prod_i \mathcal{A}^i \to \{0, 1\}. \tag{12}$$

Let G^N denote the N-fold parallel repetition of G (i.e., the game with input alphabets $(\mathcal{X}^i)^N$, output alphabets $(\mathcal{A}^i)^N$, probability distribution $p(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{x}_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot p(\mathbf{x}_n)$, and predicate $L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}) = \bigwedge_{i=1}^N L(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{a}_i)$).

A *measurement strategy* for a game G is a family $\{\{M_{\mathbf{a}|\mathbf{x}}\}_{\mathbf{a}}\}_{\mathbf{x}}$ of $\mathcal{A}$-valued measurements, indexed by $\mathcal{X}$, on a quantum register $Q = Q_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes Q_n$, where each measurement operator $M_{\mathbf{a}|\mathbf{x}}$ is given by

$$M_{\mathbf{a}|\mathbf{x}} = M^1_{a^1|x^1} \otimes \ldots \otimes M^n_{a^n|x^n} \tag{13}$$

where $\{M^i_{a^i|x^i}\}_{a^i}$ is a measurement on Q^i.

It is helpful to describe a parallel repeated game as a process. In Figure 2, we introduce the parallel repetition process $\mathrm{Par}(N, G, \mathbf{M}, \Phi)$ associated to a game G. The process Par include a final step which shuffles the different instances of the game according to a randomly chosen permutation.

[1] That is, the operator on $Q \oplus \mathbb{C}$ given by $\begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_i & \\ & 1 - \mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda_i) \end{bmatrix}$.

For any G, let $w(G)$ denote the supremum quantum score of G (i.e., the supremum of $\mathbf{P}(H_1 = 1)$ in $\mathrm{Par}(1, G, \mathbf{M}, \Phi)$ taken over all initial states $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(C)$ and all measurements strategies $\mathbf{M}$).

We will typically refer to states arising from processes as follows: the initial state will be denoted by Γ_0, and Γ_i will refer to the state that occurs after step i. The symbol Γ will denote the final state.

3 Entropy quantities

Definition 3.1. *Let QR be a bipartite quantum register, and let Γ be a subnormalized state of QR. Then,*

$$h_{min}(Q \mid R)_\Gamma = \min_{\substack{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(R) \\ I_Q \otimes \sigma \geq \Gamma}} \mathrm{Tr}(\sigma) \tag{14}$$

$$h_2(Q \mid R)_\Gamma = \mathrm{Tr}[\Gamma(\Gamma^R)^{-1/2}\Gamma(\Gamma^R)^{-1/2}]. \tag{15}$$

Let

$$h^\delta_{min}(Z \mid Y)_\Gamma = \min_{\Gamma'} h_{min}(Z \mid Y)_{\Gamma'} \tag{16}$$

where Γ' varies over all subnormalized classical-quantum states of ZY that are within distance δ from Γ under the purified distance metric P. For any subnormalized state Λ of a quantum register T, let

$$h(T)_\Lambda = 2^{\mathrm{Tr}[\Lambda \log \Lambda]}. \tag{17}$$

and let

$$h(Q \mid R) = \frac{h(QR)}{h(R)}. \tag{18}$$

Additionally, we define some entropy quantities for probability distributions.

Definition 3.2. *If p is a probability distribution on a set S, let*

$$h(S)_p = \prod_{s \in S} p(s)^{p(s)}. \tag{19}$$

If $r \in [0, 1]$, let $h(r) = r^r(1-r)^{1-r}$. (Note that this is the same as the result of applying the function h to the probability distribution $(r, 1-r)$.)

If q is a probability distribution on a set $S \times T$, let

$$h_0(S \mid T)_q = \max_t |\{s \in S \mid q(s,t) > 0\}|. \tag{20}$$

Let

$$h^\delta_0(S \mid T)_q = \min_{q'} h_0(S \mid T), \tag{21}$$

where q' varies over all subnormalized probability distributions on $S \times T$ such that $\Delta(q, q') \leq \delta$.

Let $H_*^*(\cdot \mid \cdot) = -\log h_*^*(\cdot \mid \cdot)$. (Thus, $H_{min}^\delta(Z \mid Y) = -\log h_{min}^\delta(Z \mid Y)$.)

Some intuition for these quantities is as follows: The quantity $H_{min}(Z \mid Y)$ (conditional min-entropy) is a measure of the number of bits that can be extracted from Z in the presence of an adversary who possesses Y (see [24]). The quantity $H(Z \mid Y)$ (von Neumann entropy) measures the number of bits that can be extracted in the case in which multiple copies of the state ZY are available (see Chapter 11 in [22]). The quantity $H_2(Z \mid Y)$ is the conditional collision entropy, an interpretation for which will be explained in the next subsection. The quantity $H_0(Z \mid Y)$ is a measure of the minimum number of bits needed to reconstruct the states Y from Z (see [24], which uses the notation H_{max} instead of H_0).

Collision entropy and min-entropy are related by the following proposition (see subsection 6.4.1 in [27]):

Proposition 3.3. *For any quantum registers RS, any subnormalized state Γ of RS, and any $\delta > 0$,*

$$H_{min}^\delta(R \mid S)_\Gamma \geq H_2(R \mid S)_\Gamma - \log(2/\delta^2). \quad \square \tag{22}$$

3.1 An operational interpretation of collision entropy for measurements on a pure entangled state

If Γ is a classical-quantum state of a register ZY, then a common way to describe $h_2(Z \mid Y)_\Gamma$ is that it is the likelihood that an adversary who possesses Y can guess Z via the pretty good measurement $\{(\Gamma^Y)^{-1/2}\Gamma_{Z=z}(\Gamma^Y)^{-1/2}\}_z$. We present an alternative interpretation which is useful for measuring the randomness obtained from measurements on an entangled state. The following proposition refers to the process Guess shown in Figure 3.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3$ denote the states that arise in the process Guess$(\Phi, \{P_j\}_j)$. Then,*

$$\mathbf{P}_{\Gamma_3}(J = J') \;=\; h_2(J \mid V')_{\Gamma_2}. \tag{23}$$

Proof. The states $\Gamma_2^{JE'}$ and $\Gamma_3^{JJ'}$ are given by

$$\Gamma_2 \;=\; \sum_j |j\rangle\langle j| \otimes \sqrt{\Phi}P_j\sqrt{\Phi} \tag{24}$$

$$\Gamma_3 \;=\; \sum_{j,j'} \left|jj'\right\rangle\left\langle jj'\right| \operatorname{Tr}[\sqrt{\Phi}P_j\sqrt{\Phi}P_{j'}]. \tag{25}$$

and thus

$$h_2(J \mid E')_{\Gamma_2} \;=\; \sum_j \operatorname{Tr}\left[\sqrt{\Phi}P_j\sqrt{\Phi}\Phi^{-1/2}\sqrt{\Phi}P_j\sqrt{\Phi}\Phi^{-1/2}\right] \tag{26}$$

$$\;=\; \sum_j \operatorname{Tr}\left[\sqrt{\Phi}P_j\sqrt{\Phi}P_j\right] \tag{27}$$

$$\;=\; \mathbf{P}_{\Gamma_3}[J = J'], \tag{28}$$

as desired. $\square$

4 The Magic Square Guessing Game

In this section we consider the 6-player game described in Figure 4. In this game, two pairs of players (Alice and Bob, and Alice′ and Bob′) each play the Magic Square game and their inputs and outputs are compared. There are also additional players Charlie and Charlie′ who receive a random bit and always produce the same output letter. (Note that none of the outputs Bob′, Charlie, and Charlie′ are used in the scoring rule — these players are present merely because their inputs are used in the scoring rule.)

In the game, Alice and Bob are attempting to win the Magic Square game, while Alice′ and Bob′ are simultaneously attempting to guess Alice's input, Bob's input, and Alice's key bit. However, a failure to match Alice's key bit is forgiven if it happens that Charlie and Charlie′ have the same output. (This last rule has the effect of making the game easier to win. It underlies the robustness property of our security proof for MagicQKD.)

It is obvious that $w(\text{MGuess}) \leq 1/9$, since the probability that Alice's and Bob's inputs match those of Alice′ and Bob′ is 1/9. We will prove that in fact $w(\text{MGuess}) \leq 1/9 - 0.0013$. The gap of 0.0013 will be crucial for establish a nonzero key rate for MagicQKD.

Proposition 4.1. *Let MGuess denote the game in Figure 4. Then,*

$$w(\mathit{MGuess}) \leq (1/9) - 0.0013 \tag{29}$$

Our proof can be roughly outlined as follows. The recent proof of rigidity for the Magic Square game [30] shows that if Alice and Bob win the Magic Square game with probability close to 1, then Alice's measurements must satisfy certain approximate anti-commutativity conditions. However, a score near 1/9 at the MGuess game would also make all of Alice's measurements approximately commuting. Both of these conditions cannot hold simultaneously, and thus we are able to bound $w(\text{MGuess})$ away from 1/9.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Let $\{F_x^a\}, \{G_y^b\}, \{{F'}_x^a\}$ be the measurements used by Alice, Bob, and Alice′, respectively, which we will assume (without loss of generality) to be projective, and let Φ denote their shared state, which we will assume to be pure: $\Phi = \phi\phi^*$. For $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, let F_{ij} denote the reflection operator

$$F_{ij} \quad = \quad \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{X} \\ a_j = 0}} F_i^a - \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{X} \\ a_j = 1}} F_i^a, \tag{30}$$

define F'_{ij} similarly in terms of $\{{F'}_x^a\}$, and let

$$G_{ij} \quad = \quad \sum_{\substack{b \in \mathcal{X} \\ b_i = 0}} G_j^b - \sum_{\substack{b \in \mathcal{Y} \\ b_i = 1}} G_j^b. \tag{31}$$

Note that F_{ij} and F_{ik} always commute and $F_{i1}F_{i2}F_{i3} = I$, that G_{ij} and G_{kj} always commute and $G_{1j}G_{2j}G_{3j} = -I$, and similar relationships hold for F'_{ij}.

Let

$$\delta_{ij} \quad = \quad \|(F_{ij} \otimes G_{ij} \otimes I)\phi - \phi\| \tag{32}$$

$$\epsilon_{ij} \quad = \quad \left\|(F_{ij} \otimes F'_{ij} \otimes I)\phi - \phi\right\|. \tag{33}$$

Then, we have the following (based on [30]) via repeated applications of the triangle inequality.

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(F_{11}F_{22}\otimes I)\phi-(F_{11}\otimes G_{22}\otimes I)\phi\| &\leq \delta_{22}\\
\|(F_{11}F_{22}\otimes I)\phi-(G_{22}G_{11}\otimes I)\phi\| &\leq \delta_{22}+\delta_{11}\\
\|(F_{11}F_{22}\otimes I)\phi-(G_{12}G_{32}G_{31}G_{21}\otimes I)\phi\| &\leq \delta_{11}+\delta_{22}\\
\|(F_{11}F_{22}\otimes I)\phi-(F_{21}F_{31}F_{32}\otimes G_{12}\otimes I)\phi\| &\leq \delta_{11}+\delta_{22}+(\delta_{21}+\delta_{31}+\delta_{32})\\
\|(F_{11}F_{22}\otimes I)\phi-(F_{21}F_{33}\otimes G_{12}\otimes I)\phi\| &\leq \delta_{11}+\delta_{22}+(\delta_{21}+\delta_{31}+\delta_{32})\\
\|(F_{11}F_{22}\otimes I)\phi-(F_{21}\otimes G_{12}G_{33}\otimes I)\phi\| &\leq \delta_{11}+\delta_{22}+\delta_{21}+\delta_{31}+\delta_{32}+\delta_{33}\\
\|(F_{11}F_{22}\otimes I)\phi-(-F_{21}\otimes G_{12}G_{13}G_{23}\otimes I)\phi\| &\leq \delta_{11}+\delta_{22}+\delta_{21}+\delta_{31}+\delta_{32}+\delta_{33}\\
\|(F_{11}F_{22}\otimes I)\phi-(-F_{21}F_{23}F_{13}F_{12}\otimes I)\phi\| &\leq \delta_{11}+\delta_{22}+\delta_{21}+\delta_{31}+\delta_{32}+\delta_{33}+\delta_{23}+\delta_{13}+\delta_{12}\\
\|(F_{11}F_{22}\otimes I)\phi-(-F_{22}F_{11}\otimes I)\phi\| &\leq \delta_{11}+\delta_{22}+\delta_{21}+\delta_{31}+\delta_{32}+\delta_{33}+\delta_{23}+\delta_{13}+\delta_{12}\\
\|(F_{11}F_{22}\otimes I)\phi+(F_{22}F_{11}\otimes I)\phi\| &\leq \sum_{ij}\delta_{ij}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|(F_{11}F_{22}\otimes I)\phi-(F_{11}\otimes F'_{22}\otimes I)\phi\right\| &\leq \epsilon_{22} &(34)\\
\left\|(F_{11}F_{22}\otimes I)\phi-(G_{11}\otimes F'_{22}\otimes I)\phi\right\| &\leq \epsilon_{22}+\delta_{11} &(35)\\
\|(F_{11}F_{22}\otimes I)\phi-(G_{11}\otimes F_{22}\otimes I)\phi\| &\leq \epsilon_{22}+2\delta_{11} &(36)\\
\|(F_{11}F_{22}\otimes I)\phi-(F_{22}F_{11}\otimes I)\phi\| &\leq 2\epsilon_{22}+2\delta_{11} &(37)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $(F_{11}F_{22}\otimes I)\phi$ has length one, inequalities (34) and (37) can hold simultaneously only if

$$(2\epsilon_{22}+2\delta_{11})+\sum_{ij}\delta_{ij} \geq 2. \quad (38)$$

Similar inequalities hold by the same reasoning for any ϵ_{ij} and $\delta_{i'j'}$ where $i\neq i', j\neq j'$; when we average them all, we obtain

$$(11/9)\sum_{ij}\delta_{ij}+(2/9)\sum_{ij}\epsilon_{ij} \geq 2. \quad (39)$$

Note that the probability that Alice and Bob satisfy the Magic square condition on input $X=i$, $Y=j$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
(\phi^*(F_{ij}\otimes G_{ij}\otimes I)\phi+1)/2 &= 2-\|(F_{ij}\otimes G_{ij}\otimes I)\phi-\phi\|^2 &(40)\\
&= 2-\delta_{ij}^2, &(41)
\end{aligned}$$

and the probability that $(A_Y)=A'_{Y'}$ when $X=X'=i$ and $Y=Y'=j$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
(\phi^*(F_{ij}\otimes F'_{ij}\otimes I)\phi+1)/2 &= 2-\left\|(F_{ij}\otimes F'_{ij}\otimes I)\phi-\phi\right\|^2 &(42)\\
&= 2-\epsilon_{ij}^2, &(43)
\end{aligned}$$

Let w be the probability that the game is won. Then,

$$w\leq\frac{1}{9}\left(1-(1/18)\sum_{ij}\delta_{ij}^2\right) \quad (44)$$

(since the game will be lost if $X \neq X'$, $Y \neq Y'$, or $(A_X \neq B_Y \wedge Z \neq Z')$) and also

$$w \leq \frac{1}{9}\left(1 - (1/18)\sum_{ij} \epsilon_{ij}^2\right) \tag{45}$$

(since the game will be lost if $X \neq X'$, $Y \neq Y'$, or $(A_Y \neq A'_{Y'} \wedge Z \neq Z')$). We must have either $\sum \delta_{ij} \geq 18/13$ or $\sum \epsilon_{ij} \geq 18/13$ (since otherwise (39) could not hold). Since $\left(\sum_{ij} \delta_{ij}^2\right) \geq (1/9)(\sum_{ij} \delta_{ij})^2$ and likewise for ϵ_{ij}, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w &\leq \frac{1}{9}\left[1 - (1/18)(1/9)(18/13)^2\right] && (46)\\ &\leq \frac{1}{9} - 0.0013, && (47) \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Theorem 4.2. *Let Γ denote the final state of the process $Par(N, MGuess, \mathbf{M}, \Phi)$ (see Figures 2 and4). Let $m \leq N/2$ be a positive integer. Then,*

$$\mathbf{P}_\Gamma(W_1 \wedge W_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge W_m) \leq \left(w(MGuess) + O(\sqrt{m/N})\right)^m. \tag{48}$$

Proof. This follows from Theorem A.9 in the appendix. □

5 Security Proof

5.1 An Intermediate Result

In order to show that Alice's raw key in MagicQKD is sufficiently random, we begin by analyzing the entropy produced by the related protocol MagicKey in Figure 5. In MagicKey, we use an idea originated in our previous work on randomness expansion [21, 20]: when Alice and Bob fail to win the Magic Square game, we compensate by artificially introducing randomness. In [11] this artificial randomness is represented by additional registers that have some prescribed entropy, and we adopt the same style here (by including the registers $T_1, \ldots, T_N$). We use these auxilliary registers to establish a lower bound on collision entropy, and the registers will subsequently be dropped.

The following proposition addresses the amount of collision entropy that is collectively contained in Alice's and Bob's inputs, Alice's key register, and the auxilliary registers T_i.

Theorem 5.1. *Let Γ be the final state of MagicKey. Then,*

$$h_2(X_{1\ldots\epsilon N} Y_{1\ldots\epsilon N} R_{1\ldots\epsilon N} T_{1\ldots\epsilon N} \mid EF)_\Gamma \leq (w(MGuess) + O(\sqrt{\epsilon}))^{\epsilon N} \tag{49}$$

Note that in the above statement, we are conditioning not only on the register E but also on the permutation register F.

Proof. We prove this result via an application of Proposition 3.4. Upon an appropriate unitary embedding, we may also assume $E = C'D'$, where C', D' are copies of C, D, and that Φ is a

canonical purification of Φ^{CD} (i.e., $\Phi^{CD} = \Phi^{C'D'}$). Suppose that the process $\mathrm{Par}(N, \mathrm{MGuess}, \mathbf{M}, \Phi)$ is executed with the measurement strategy[2]

$$\mathbf{M} = \{P^{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{a}} \otimes Q^{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{b}} \otimes I \otimes P^{\mathbf{x}'}_{\mathbf{a}'} \otimes Q^{\mathbf{y}'}_{\mathbf{b}'} \otimes I\}, \tag{50}$$

For any m-subset Z of $\{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$, the probability that $\bigwedge_{i \in Z} W_i = 1$ after step 4 in the process $\mathrm{Par}(N, \mathrm{MGuess}, \mathbf{M}, \Phi)$ is the same as the value of

$$h_2(\{X_i Y_i R_i T_i \mid i \in Z\} \mid E) \tag{51}$$

after step 6 in MagicKey. The average of the former quantity over all (ϵN)-subsets is equal to the value of $\mathbf{P}(W_1 \wedge W_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge W_{\epsilon N})$ at the conclusion of $\mathrm{Par}(N, \mathrm{MGuess}, \mathbf{M}, \Phi)$, while the average of the latter quantity is equal to the expression on the lefthand side of (49). The desired result follows from Theorem 4.2. □

By Proposition 3.3, we can deduce an upper bound on smooth min-entropy. For compatibility with later derivations, we will take the error parameter to be $2\exp(-\epsilon^3 N)$. We have the following.

Corollary 5.2. *Let Γ be the final state of MagicKey. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} H_{min}^{2\exp(-\epsilon^3 N)}(X_{1\ldots\epsilon N} Y_{1\ldots\epsilon N} R_{1\ldots\epsilon N} T_{1\ldots\epsilon N} \mid EF)_\Gamma &\geq \epsilon N[\log \frac{1}{w(MGuess)} - O(\sqrt{\epsilon})] - 2(\log e)\epsilon^3 N + 1. \\ &\geq \epsilon N[3.18 - O(\sqrt{\epsilon})]. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Let $WIN(\delta)$ be the event $\sum_{i=1}^{\epsilon N} W_i \geq (1-\delta)\epsilon N$. Then,

$$H_{min}^{2\exp(-\epsilon^3 N)}(X_{1\ldots\epsilon N} Y_{1\ldots\epsilon N} R_{1\ldots\epsilon N} T_{1\ldots\epsilon N} \mid EF)_{\Gamma_{WIN(\delta)}} \geq \epsilon N[3.18 - O(\sqrt{\epsilon})]. \tag{52}$$

The register T under the subnormalized state $\Gamma_{WIN(\delta)}$ is supported only on binary strings of Hamming weight less than δ. Thus, applying Proposition B.1, we drop the register T from the inequality above and obtain the following.

Corollary 5.3. *Let Γ be the final state of MagicQKD. For any $\delta > 0$,*

$$H_{min}^{2\exp(-\epsilon^3 N)}(X_{1\ldots\epsilon N} Y_{1\ldots\epsilon N} R_{1\ldots\epsilon N} T_{1\ldots\epsilon N} \mid EF)_{\Gamma_{WIN(\delta)}} \geq \epsilon N[3.18 - O(\sqrt{\epsilon}) - H(\delta)]. \quad \square$$

5.2 Device-Independent Quantum Key Distribution

We now turn our attention toward the protocol MagicQKD (Figure 1). We will prove that MagicQKD generates a positive key rate. Our final statement will use the registers

$$\begin{aligned} AliceKey &:= R_{1\cdots\epsilon N} && (53) \\ BobKey &:= S_{1\cdots\epsilon N} && (54) \\ Eve &:= X_{1\cdots\epsilon N} Y_{1\cdots\epsilon N} R_{1\cdots\epsilon^2 N} S_{1\cdots\epsilon^2 N} EF. && (55) \end{aligned}$$

We will first need the following lemma.

[2]Here the tensor product respects the following ordering of the players: Alice, Bob, Charlie, Alice′, Bob′, Charlie′. Charlie and Charlie′ have trivial output, and we treat them as simply performing a unary measurement on a one-dimensional register.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $WIN(\delta)$ denote the event (at the conclusion of MagicQKD) that*

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{\epsilon N} W_i}{\epsilon N} \geq 1-\delta. \tag{56}$$

Let $SUCC$ denote the event that the protocol MagicQKD succeeds. Then,

$$\mathbf{P}(SUCC \cap \neg WIN(5\epsilon)) \leq \exp(-2\epsilon^3 N). \tag{57}$$

Proof. The event $SUCC \cap \neg WIN(5\epsilon)$ implies that the gap between the average score over games $1 \dots \epsilon^2 N$ and the average score over games $1 \dots \epsilon N$ is more than 4ϵ. By Corollary B.3, this occurs with probability no more than $\exp(-(4\epsilon - 2\epsilon)^2 \epsilon N/2) = \exp(-2\epsilon^3 N)$. □

By Corollary 5.3, which we proved in the previous subsection for MagicKey, the final state Γ of the protocol MagicQKD satisfies the following (we will omit the symbol Γ for compactness):

$$\begin{aligned} & H_{min}^{\exp(-2\epsilon^3 N)}(X_{1\dots\epsilon N} Y_{1\dots\epsilon N} R_{1\dots\epsilon N} \mid EF)_{WIN(5\epsilon)} \\ \geq\ & \epsilon N[3.18 - H(5\epsilon) - O(\sqrt{\epsilon})] \\ \geq\ & \epsilon N[3.18 - O(\sqrt{\epsilon})]. \end{aligned}$$

Upon conditioning on the registers $X_{1\dots\epsilon N} Y_{1\dots\epsilon N}$, which have entropy at most $(\log 9)\epsilon N \leq (3.17)\epsilon N$, we obtain the following:

$$H_{min}^{2\exp(-\epsilon^3 N)}(R_{1\dots\epsilon N} \mid X_{1\dots\epsilon N} Y_{1\dots\epsilon N} EF)_{WIN(5\epsilon)} \geq \epsilon N[0.01 - O(\sqrt{\epsilon})].$$

Upon conditioning on the registers $R_{1\dots\epsilon^2 N} S_{1\dots\epsilon^2 N}$, which have entropy at most $2\epsilon^2 N$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} H_{min}^{2\exp(-\epsilon^3 N)}(AliceKey \mid Eve)_{WIN(5\epsilon)} &\geq \epsilon N[0.01 - O(\sqrt{\epsilon})] - 2\epsilon^2 N \\ &\geq \epsilon N[0.01 - O(\sqrt{\epsilon})]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $SUCC$ denote the event that MagicQKD succeeds. When we restrict further to the event $SUCC \cap WIN(5\epsilon)$, we obtain

$$H_{min}^{2\exp(-\epsilon^3 N)}(AliceKey \mid Eve)_{SUCC \cap WIN(5\epsilon)} \geq \epsilon N[0.01 - O(\sqrt{\epsilon})].$$

Applying Lemma 5.4, the Δ-distance between $\Gamma_{WIN(5\epsilon)\cap SUCC}$ and Γ_{SUCC} is upper bounded by $\exp(-2\epsilon^3 N)$, and therefore the purified distance between the same two events is upper bounded by $\sqrt{2\exp(-2\epsilon^3 N)} = \sqrt{2}\exp(-\epsilon^3 N)$. Therefore,

$$H_{min}^{4\exp(-\epsilon^3 N)}(AliceKey \mid Eve)_{SUCC} \geq \epsilon N[0.01 - O(\sqrt{\epsilon})].$$

Next we compare $AliceKey$ and $BobKey$. By Lemma B.1,

$$H_0(AliceKey \mid BobKey)_{WIN(5\epsilon)} \leq \epsilon N H(5\epsilon), \tag{58}$$

thus,

$$H_0(AliceKey \mid BobKey)_{SUCC \cap WIN(5\epsilon)} \leq \epsilon N H(5\epsilon), \tag{59}$$

and therefore by Lemma 5.4,

$$H_0^{\exp(-2\epsilon^3 N)}(AliceKey \mid BobKey)_{SUCC} \leq \epsilon N H(5\epsilon), \tag{60}$$

Combining (58) with (60), we have the following.

Theorem 5.5. *Let* $\delta = \delta(\epsilon, N) = 4\exp(-\epsilon^3 N)$. *The final state* Γ *of MagicQKD satisfies*

$$H^{\delta}_{min}(AliceKey \mid Eve)_{SUCC} - H^{\delta}_{0}(AliceKey \mid BobKey)_{SUCC} \quad \geq \quad \epsilon N[0.01 - O(\sqrt{\epsilon})].$$

Note that to achieve a nonzero rate, it suffices to choose ϵ sufficiently small so that the function represented by $O(\sqrt{\epsilon})$ in the above inequality is smaller than 0.01.

References

[1] David Adrian, Karthikeyan Bhargavan, Zakir Durumeric, Pierrick Gaudry, Matthew Green 0001, J. Alex Halderman, Nadia Heninger, Drew Springall, Emmanuel Thomé, Luke Valenta, Benjamin VanderSloot, Eric Wustrow, Santiago Zanella Béguelin, and Paul Zimmermann. Imperfect forward secrecy: How diffie-hellman fails in practice. In Indrajit Ray, Ninghui Li, and Christopher Kruegel, editors, *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, Denver, CO, USA, October 12-6, 2015*, pages 5–17. ACM, 2015.

[2] Rotem Arnon-Friedman, Renato Renner, and Thomas Vidick. Simple and tight device-independent security proofs. arXiv:1607.01797, 2016.

[3] Mohammad Bavarian, Thomas Vidick, and Henry Yuen. Anchoring games for parallel repetition, 2015. arXiv:1509.07466.

[4] Michael Ben-Or, Michał Horodecki, Debbie W Leung, Dominic Mayers, and Jonathan Oppenheim. The universal composable security of quantum key distribution. In *Theory of Cryptography Conference*, pages 386–406. Springer, 2005.

[5] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard. Quantum cryptography: Public key distribution and coin tossing. In *Proceedings of IEEE international Conference on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing, Bangalore, India*, page 175, New York, 1984. IEEE Press.

[6] André Chailloux and Giannicola Scarpa. *Parallel Repetition of Entangled Games with Exponential Decay via the Superposed Information Cost*, pages 296–307. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2014.

[7] Kai-Min Chung, Xiaodi Wu, and Henry Yuen. Parallel repetition for entangled k-player games via fast quantum search. In *Proceedings of the 30th Conference on Computational Complexity*, pages 512–536. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2015.

[8] Roger Colbeck and Adrian Kent. Private randomness expansion with untrusted devices. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 44(9):095305, 2011.

[9] Aymard de Touzalin, Charles Marcus, Freeke Heijman, Ignacio Cirac, Richard Murray, , and Tommaso Calarco. Quantum manifesto. `http://qurope.eu/system/files/u7/93056_Quantum%20Manifesto_WEB.pdf`.

[10] W. Diffie and M. Hellman. New directions in cryptography. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 22(6):644–654, November 1976.

[11] Frederic Dupuis, Omar Fawzi, and Renato Renner. Entropy accumulation. arXiv:1607.01796, 2016.

[12] Daniel Genkin, Lev Pachmanov, Itamar Pipman, and Eran Tromer. Stealing keys from PCs using a radio: Cheap electromagnetic attacks on windowed exponentiation. In Tim Güneysu and Helena Handschuh, editors, *Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems – CHES 2015: 17th International Workshop, Saint-Malo, France, September 13-16, 2015, Proceedings*, pages 207–228, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2015. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

[13] Marissa Giustina, Marijn A. M. Versteegh, Sören Wengerowsky, Johannes Handsteiner, Armin Hochrainer, Kevin Phelan, Fabian Steinlechner, Johannes Kofler, Jan-Åke Larsson, Carlos Abellán, Waldimar Amaya, Valerio Pruneri, Morgan W. Mitchell, Jörn Beyer, Thomas Gerrits, Adriana E. Lita, Lynden K. Shalm, Sae Woo Nam, Thomas Scheidl, Rupert Ursin, Bernhard Wittmann, and Anton Zeilinger. Significant-loophole-free test of bell's theorem with entangled photons. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 115:250401, Dec 2015.

[14] B. Hensen, H. Bernien, A. Dreau, A. Reiserer, N. Kalb, M. Blok, J. Ruitenberg, R. Vermeulen, R. Schouten, C. Abellan, W. Amaya, V. Pruneri, W. Mitchell, M. Markham, D. Twitchen, D. Elkouss, S. Wehner, T. Taminiau, and R. Hanson. Loophole-free Bell inequality violation using electron spins separated by 1.3 kilometres. *Nature*, 526:682–686, 2015.

[15] Thomas Holenstein. Parallel repetition: simplifications and the no-signaling case. In *Proceedings of the thirty-ninth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 411–419. ACM, 2007.

[16] R. Jain, A. Pereszlenyi, and Penghui Yao. A parallel repetition theorem for entangled two-player one-round games under product distributions. In *2014 IEEE 29th Conference on Computational Complexity (CCC)*, pages 209–216, June 2014.

[17] H.-K. Lo and H. F. Chau. Unconditional security of quantum key distribution over arbitrarily long distances. *Science*, 283(5410):2050–2056, March 1999.

[18] Dominic Mayers. Unconditional security in quantum cryptography. *J. ACM*, 48(3):351–406, 2001.

[19] Dominic Mayers and Andrew Yao. Quantum cryptography with imperfect apparatus. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 1998. Proceedings. 39th Annual Symposium on*, pages 503–509. IEEE, 1998.

[20] Carl A. Miller and Yaoyun Shi. Universal security for randomness expansion from the spot-checking protocol. arXiv:1411.6608v3, 2015.

[21] Carl A. Miller and Yaoyun Shi. Robust protocols for securely expanding randomness and distributing keys using untrusted quantum devices. *J. ACM*, 63(4):33:1–33:63, October 2016.

[22] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.

[23] Ran Raz. A parallel repetition theorem. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 27(3):763–803, 1998.

[24] Renato Renner. *Security of Quantum Key Distribution*. PhD thesis, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich, 2005.

[25] Lynden K. Shalm, Evan Meyer-Scott, Bradley G. Christensen, Peter Bierhorst, Michael A. Wayne, Martin J. Stevens, Thomas Gerrits, Scott Glancy, Deny R. Hamel, Michael S. Allman, Kevin J. Coakley, Shellee D. Dyer, Carson Hodge, Adriana E. Lita, Varun B. Verma, Camilla Lambrocco, Edward Tortorici, Alan L. Migdall, Yanbao Zhang, Daniel R. Kumor, William H. Farr, Francesco Marsili, Matthew D. Shaw, Jeffrey A. Stern, Carlos Abellán, Waldimar Amaya, Valerio Pruneri, Thomas Jennewein, Morgan W. Mitchell, Paul G. Kwiat, Joshua C. Bienfang,

Richard P. Mirin, Emanuel Knill, and Sae Woo Nam. Strong loophole-free test of local realism. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 115:250402, Dec 2015.

[26] Peter W Shor and John Preskill. Simple proof of security of the BB84 quantum key distribution protocol. *Physical review letters*, 85(2):441, 2000.

[27] Marco Tomamichel. *Quantum Information Processing with Finite Resources - Mathematical Foundations*. Springer, 2016.

[28] JH van Lint. *Introduction to Coding Theory*, volume 86. Springer Science & Business Media, 1998.

[29] Umesh Vazirani and Thomas Vidick. Fully device-independent quantum key distribution. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 113:140501, Sep 2014.

[30] Xingyao Wu, Jean-Daniel Bancal, Matthew McKague, and Valerio Scarani. Device-independent parallel self-testing of two singlets. *Physical Review A*, 93(6):062121, 2016.

A A parallel repetition result for n-player free games

This section proves a parallel repetition result for n-player free games which is a derivative of known techniques, including [6, 16, 7, 3].

A.1 Information-theoretic lemmas

Definition A.1. *The* relative entropy *between quantum states ρ and σ is defined as $S(\rho\|\sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Tr}\rho\log\rho - \mathrm{Tr}\rho\log\sigma$. The* relative min-entropy *between them is defined as $S_\infty(\rho\|\sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{\lambda : \rho \leq 2^\lambda\sigma\}$. Since the logarithm is operator-monotone, $S(\rho\|\sigma) \leq S_\infty(\rho\|\sigma)$.*

Definition A.2. *For quantum state ρ^{XY} the mutual information between X and Y, denoted $I(X:Y)_\rho$ is defined as:*

$$I(X:Y)_\rho = S(\rho^{XY}\|\rho^X \otimes \rho^Y).$$

If ρ^{XY} is a classical-quantum state $\sum_x p(x)\,|x\rangle\langle x|^X \otimes \rho_x^Y$ then,

$$I(X:Y)_\rho = S(\rho^{XY}\|\rho^X \otimes \rho^Y) = \mathbb{E}_{x\leftarrow X}[S(\rho_x^Y\|\rho^Y)].$$

Fact A.3 (Uhlmann's theorem)**.** *Given quantum states ρ, σ, and a purification $|\psi\rangle$ of ρ, it holds that $F(\rho,\sigma) = \max_{|\phi\rangle} |\langle\phi|\psi\rangle|$, where the maximum is taken over all purifications of σ. In particular there is an isometry that takes $|\phi\rangle$ to $|\psi\rangle$.*

Fact A.4 (Pinsker's inequality)**.** *For quantum states ρ^X, σ^X, it holds that*

$$S(\rho^X\|\sigma^X) \geq 1 - F(\rho^X,\sigma^X) \geq \frac{1}{2}P^2(\rho^X,\sigma^X).$$

Fact A.5. *For quantum states ρ^{XY}, σ^X, and τ^Y, it holds that*

$$S(\rho^{XY}\|\sigma^X \otimes \tau^Y) \geq S(\rho^{XY}\|\rho^X \otimes \rho^Y) = I(X:Y)_\rho.$$

Fact A.6 (Chain rule)**.** *Let $X_1,\ldots,X_n$ be independent random variables and let $X = X_1,\ldots,X_n$. Let ρ^{XE} be a classical-quantum state. Then*

$$I(X:E)_\rho \geq \sum_{j=1}^n I(X_j:E)_\rho.$$

Lemma A.7. *Let $\rho^{XY} = \rho^X \otimes \rho^Y$ and $S_\infty(\sigma^{XY}\|\rho^{XY}) \leq k$. Then $I(X:Y)_\sigma \leq k$.*

Proof. Consider,

$$\begin{aligned} I(X:Y)_\sigma &= S(\sigma^{XY}\|\sigma^X \otimes \sigma^Y) \\ &\leq S(\sigma^{XY}\|\rho^X \otimes \rho^Y) && \text{from Fact A.5} \\ &= S(\sigma^{XY}\|\rho^{XY}) \\ &\leq S_\infty(\sigma^{XY}\|\rho^{XY}) \leq k\ . \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma A.8. *Let $|\psi\rangle^{S\overline{S}Q\overline{Q}}$ be as follows (where S is $\mathcal{S}$ valued),*

$$|\psi\rangle^{S\overline{S}Q\overline{Q}} \quad = \quad \sum_s \sqrt{p(s)}\,|s\rangle^S\,|s\rangle^{\overline{S}} \otimes |\psi_s\rangle^{Q\overline{Q}}.$$

Suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} I(S:Q)_\psi &\leq \epsilon, \\ (\log|\mathcal{S}|) - H(S)_\psi &\leq \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

There exists an S-controlled isometry V on $\overline{Q}$ such that

$$\left\| (V \otimes I^Q)\psi^{SQ\overline{Q}}(V \otimes I^Q) - U^S \otimes |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \right\|_1 \quad \leq \quad 4\sqrt{\epsilon},$$

where U^S is the maximally mixed state on S.

Proof. Consider (using Fact A.4),

$$\epsilon \geq I(S:Q)_\psi = \mathbb{E}_{s\leftarrow S}[S(\psi_s^Q \| \psi^Q)] \geq \mathbb{E}_{s\leftarrow S}[\frac{1}{2}P^2(\psi_s^Q, \psi^Q)].$$

Using Fact A.3 (and concavity of square-root) we get an S-controlled isometry on $\overline{Q}$ such that,

$$P\left((V \otimes I^Q)\psi^{SQ\overline{Q}}(V \otimes I^Q), \psi^S \otimes |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\right) \leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon}.$$

Also from Fact A.4,

$$\epsilon \geq \log|\mathcal{T}| - H(T)_\psi = S(\psi^S \| U^S) \geq \frac{1}{2}P^2(\psi^S, U^S).$$

Combining the two equations above, using triangle-inequality for purified distance and the relation $P \geq \Delta$ we get the desired. □

A.2 A Parallel Repetition Result

Theorem A.9. *For any $m \leq N/2$, the final state of the process* PureParallel *(Figure 6) satisfies*

$$\mathbf{P}(W_1 = W_2 = \ldots = W_m = 1) \quad \leq \quad (w(G) + O_G(\sqrt{m/N}))^m.$$

Proof. Throughout this proof we will assume that the game G is fixed (and thus we will avoid needing to note any dependence in big-O terms on the parameters of the game). Let $k \leq m$. If for a given permutation P, $\mathbf{P}(W_1 = W_2 = \ldots W_k = 1) \leq (w(G))^m$, then we are done. So we will assume for the proof that $\mathbf{P}(W_1 = W_2 = \ldots = W_k = 1) > (w(G))^m$.

Let $\Gamma = \Gamma_{k+3}$ (i.e., the state after the registers from the kth game have been measured). Then for each i,

$$I(X^i_{k+1\ldots N} : X^{\hat{i}}_{k+1\ldots N} X'^{\hat{i}}_{k+1\ldots N} A^{\hat{i}}_{k+1\ldots N} C^{\hat{i}})_\Gamma \quad = \quad 0$$

since the ith player's inputs are independent of any information possessed by the other players. Let $\Gamma' = (\Gamma)_{|W_1=W_2=\ldots=W_k=1}$. Then, since we assumed that the event $W_1 = W_2 = \ldots = W_k = 1$ occurs

with probability $\geq 2^{-O(m)}$, we have $S_\infty(\Gamma'\|\Gamma) \leq O(m)$. This implies (since the size of $X_{1\ldots k}A_{1\ldots k}$ is $O(k)$),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{x_{1\ldots k}a_{1\ldots k}\leftarrow(X_{1\ldots k}A_{1\ldots k})_{\Gamma'}}[S_\infty(\Gamma'_{x_{1\ldots k}a_{1\ldots k}}\|\Gamma)] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{x_{1\ldots k}a_{1\ldots k}\leftarrow(X_{1\ldots k}A_{1\ldots k})_{\Gamma'}}[S_\infty(\Gamma'_{x_{1\ldots k}a_{1\ldots k}}\|\Gamma') + S_\infty(\Gamma'\|\Gamma)] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_{1\ldots k}a_{1\ldots k}\leftarrow(X_{1\ldots k}A_{1\ldots k})_{\Gamma'}}\left[\log\left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{P}((X_{1\ldots k}A_{1\ldots k})_{\Gamma'}=x_{1\ldots k}a_{1\ldots k})}\right) + S_\infty(\Gamma'\|\Gamma)\right] \\
&\leq H(\Gamma' X_{1\ldots k}A_{1\ldots k}) + O(m) \leq O(m)\ .
\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma A.7 we have,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_{1\ldots k}a_{1\ldots k}\leftarrow(X_{1\ldots k}A_{1\ldots k})_{\Gamma'}}[I(X^i_{k+1\ldots N} : X^{\hat{i}}_{k+1\ldots N}X'^{\hat{i}}_{k+1\ldots N}A^{\hat{i}}_{k+1\ldots N}C^{\hat{i}})_{\Gamma'_{x_{1\ldots k}a_{1\ldots k}}}] \quad \leq \quad O(m).$$

Let J be uniformly distributed in $\{k+1,\ldots,N\}$. From Fact A.6,

$$\begin{gathered}
\mathbb{E}_{j\leftarrow J,x_{1\ldots k}a_{1\ldots k}\leftarrow(X_{1\ldots k}A_{1\ldots k})_{\Gamma'}}[I(X^i_j : X^{\hat{i}}_{k+1\ldots N}X'^{\hat{i}}_{k+1\ldots N}A^{\hat{i}}_{k+1\ldots N}C^{\hat{i}})_{\Gamma'_{x_{1\ldots k}a_{1\ldots k}}}] \\
\leq O(m)/(N-k) \leq O(m)/(N/2) = O(m/N).
\end{gathered}$$

By similar reasoning,

$$\mathbb{E}_{j\leftarrow J,x_{1\ldots k}a_{1\ldots k}\leftarrow(X_{1\ldots k}A_{1\ldots k})_{\Gamma'}}[H(X^i_j)_{\Gamma'_{x_{1\ldots k}a_{1\ldots k}}}] \geq \left|\mathcal{X}^i\right| - O(m/N).$$

By Lemma A.8, we can find a $JX_{1\ldots k}A_{1\ldots k}X^i_J$-controlled isometry V^i on the registers of the ith player such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{j\leftarrow J,x_{1\ldots k}a_{1\ldots k}\leftarrow(X_{1\ldots k}A_{1\ldots k})_{\Gamma'}}\left[\left\|(V^i\otimes I)\Gamma'^{\widehat{X'^i_j}}_{x_{1\ldots k}a_{1\ldots k}}(V^i\otimes I) - U^{X^i_j}\otimes\Gamma'\right\|_1\right] \quad \leq \quad O(\sqrt{m/N}).$$

This shows (using triangle inequality for Δ) that if each player i on sharing randomness J and state Γ' with other players and on receiving input U^{X^i} applies the inverse of (the unitary implementation of) V^i, then they can achieve success probability at least

$$\mathbb{E}_{j\leftarrow J,x_{1\ldots k}a_{1\ldots k}\leftarrow(X_{1\ldots k}A_{1\ldots k})_{\Gamma'}}[\mathbf{P}(W_j=1)_{\Gamma'_{x_{1\ldots k}a_{1\ldots k}}}] - O(\sqrt{m/N})$$

which must be at most $w(G)$. Thus we have

$$\mathbf{P}(W_1=W_2=\ldots=W_{k+1}=1)_{\Gamma_{k+4}} \quad \leq \quad \mathbf{P}(W_1=W_2=\ldots=W_k=1)_{\Gamma_{k+3}}[w(G)+O(\sqrt{/N})].$$

The desired result follows by induction. □

B Some probabilistic lemmas

Proposition B.1. *For any $c\in[0,1/2]$ and any positive integer N, let $L_{c,N}$ denote the number of N-length binary strings whose sum is less than or equal to cN. Then, $L_{c,N}\leq 2^{NH(c)}$.*

Proof. We have $L_{c,N}=\sum_{0\leq i\leq cN}\binom{N}{i}$. The desired inequality is given in Theorem 1.4.5 in [28]. □

Proposition B.2. *Let $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \{0,1\}$, and let Σ be a random variable which is uniformly distributed on the set of all permutations of $\{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$. Let $\delta > 0$ and $m \leq N/2$. Then,*

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m} x_{\Sigma(j)}}{m} - \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N} x_j}{N} > \frac{2m}{N} + \delta\right) \leq \exp(\delta^2 N/2). \tag{61}$$

Proof. Let $a = (\sum_{j=1}^{N} x_j)$. For any $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m-1\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E[x_{\Sigma(j+1)} \mid x_{\Sigma(1)} \ldots x_{\Sigma(j)}] &= \frac{a - \sum_{i=1}^{j} x_{\Sigma(i)}}{N - j} && (62)\\
&\leq \frac{a}{N-m} && (63)\\
&= \frac{a}{N} + a(\frac{1}{N-m} - \frac{1}{N}) && (64)\\
&\leq \frac{a}{N} + N(\frac{1}{N-m} - \frac{1}{N}) && (65)\\
&\leq \frac{a}{N} + \frac{m}{N-m} && (66)\\
&\leq \frac{a}{N} + \frac{m}{N/2} && (67)\\
&\leq \frac{a}{N} + \frac{2m}{N}. && (68)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore by Azuma's inequality,

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m} x_{\Sigma(j)}}{m} > \frac{a}{N} + \frac{2m}{N} + \delta\right) \leq \exp(-\delta^2 m/2), \tag{69}$$

which implies the desired result. □

Corollary B.3. *Let $X_1, \ldots, X_N$ be binary random variables with a joint distribution that is invariant under permutations of $\{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$, and let $m \leq N/2$ and $\delta > 0$. Then,*

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m} X_j}{m} - \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N} X_j}{N} > \frac{2m}{N} + \delta\right) \leq \exp(\delta^2 N/2). \quad \square \tag{70}$$

Quantum Key Distribution Protocol (MagicQKD)

Parties: Alice, Bob, Eve

Parameters:

ϵ : A rational number from the interval $(0, 1/2]$

N : A positive integer such that $N\epsilon^2$ is an integer

Equipment:

$D = (D_1, D_2)$: A two-part quantum device for playing N copies of the Magic Square game

E: A quantum system (possessed by Eve) which purifies the initial state of D.

Z: A noiseless authenticated public classical channel.

Procedure:

1. Alice chooses $X_1, \ldots, X_N \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ uniformly at random, gives $(X_1, \ldots, X_N)$ to D_1 as input, and records output $(A_1, \ldots, A_N)$.

2. Bob chooses $Y_1, \ldots, Y_N \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ uniformly at random, gives $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$ to D_2 as input, and records output $(B_1, \ldots, B_N)$.

3. Alice chooses a random permutation $F \colon \{1, 2, \ldots, N\} \to \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ and broadcasts it to Bob. The players apply permutation F to $\{X_i\}, \{Y_i\}, \{A_i\}, \{B_i\}$.

4. Alice broadcasts $(X_1, \ldots, X_{\epsilon N})$ and Bob broadcasts $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_{\epsilon N})$.

5. For $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \epsilon N\}$, Alice records $R_j := (A_j)_{Y_j}$, and Bob records $S_j := (B_j)_{X_j}$.

6. Alice broadcasts $(R_1, \ldots, R_{\epsilon^2 N})$ and Bob broadcasts $(S_1, \ldots, S_{\epsilon^2 N})$.

7. If the average score at the Magic Square game on games $1, \ldots, \epsilon^2 N$ is below $1 - \epsilon$, the protocol aborts. Otherwise, the protocol succeeds, and Alice's raw key consists of the sequence $(R_1, \ldots, R_{\epsilon N})$ and Bob's raw key consists of the sequence $(S_1, \ldots, S_{\epsilon N})$.

Figure 1: A protocol for key distribution.

The Parallel Repetition Process (Par)

Parameters:

N:	A positive integer
G:	An n-player game with input alphabet $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{X}^n$ and output alphabets $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{A}^n$
$\{M_{\mathbf{a}\|\mathbf{x}}\}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}}$:	A measurement strategy for G^N on an n-partite register $C_1 \cdots C_n$
Φ:	A state of $C^1 \ldots C^n$.

Registers:

$\{C^k \mid 1 \leq k \leq n\}$:	Quantum registers (for players $1, 2, \ldots, n$, respectively)
$\{X_j^k \mid 1 \leq j \leq N, 1 \leq k \leq n\}$:	Input registers (where X_j^k is $\mathcal{X}^k$-valued)
$\{A_j^k \mid 1 \leq j \leq N, 1 \leq k \leq n\}$:	Output registers (where A_j^k is $\mathcal{A}^k$-valued)
$\{W_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq N\}$:	Score registers (bit-valued).

Procedure:

1. Prepare C in state Φ.
2. For each $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$, choose $(x_j^1, \ldots, x_j^n) = (X_j^1, \ldots, X_j^n)$ at random according to the input distribution for game G.
3. For each i, apply the measurement $\{M_{a^i|x^i}\}_{a^i}$ to the system C_i and record the result in the registers $(A_1^i, \ldots, A_N^i)$.
4. Let $W_i = 1$ if the ith game has been won, and let $W_i = 0$ if the ith game has been lost.
5. Choose a permutation $\sigma \in \mathrm{Perm}\{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ at random. Apply the permutation σ to the registers $\{X_j\}$, the registers $\{A_j\}$, and the registers $\{W_j\}$.

Figure 2: A process defining the parallel repetition of a game.

The Guessing Process (Guess)

Parameters:

Φ: A state of a register V

$\{P_j \mid j \in \mathcal{J}\}$: A measurement on V

Registers:

V, V': Registers with a fixed isomorphism $V \cong V'$

J, J': $\mathcal{J}$-valued registers

Procedure:

1. Prepare VV' in a canonical purification of Φ.
2. Measure V with $\{P_j\}$ and store the result in J.
3. Measure V' with $\{P_j\}$ and store the result in J'.

Figure 3: A process for guessing measurement outcomes via a purification

The Magic Square Guessing Game (MGuess)

Players: Alice, Bob, Charlie, Alice$'$, Bob$'$, Charlie$'$

Alphabets:

$\mathcal{X} = \{1,2,3\}$: The input alphabet for Alice and Alice$'$

$\mathcal{Y} = \{1,2,3\}$: The input alphabet for Bob and Bob$'$

$\mathcal{Z} = \{0,1\}$: The input alphabet for Charlie and Charlie$'$

$\mathcal{A} = \{g_1g_2g_3 \in \{0,1\}^3 \mid \bigoplus g_i = 0\}$: The output alphabet for Alice and Alice$'$

$\mathcal{B} = \{g_1g_2g_3 \in \{0,1\}^3 \mid \bigoplus g_i = 1\}$: The output alphabet for Bob and Bob$'$

$\mathcal{C} = \{0\}$: The output alphabet for Charlie and Charlie$'$

Probability distribution:

$$p(x,y,z,x',y',z') = \frac{1}{18^2} \qquad \text{(uniform)}$$

Predicate:

$$L \;=\; [(x,y,a_y) = (x',y',a'_{y'})] \wedge [(a_y = b_x) \vee (z = z')].$$

The game is won if all three of the following conditions hold:

1. Alice and Bob's inputs match those of Alice$'$ and Bob$'$.
2. Alice's key bit matches that of Alice$'$.
3. Either $z = z'$ or Alice and Bob win the Magic Square game.

Figure 4: A game with 6 players.

The Magic Square Key Process (MagicKey)

Parameters:

ϵ :	A rational number from $(0, 1/2]$
N :	A positive integer such that $N\epsilon^2$ is an integer
$\{P_{\mathbf{a}\|\mathbf{x}} \otimes Q_{\mathbf{b}\|\mathbf{y}}\}$:	A measurement strategy for MagicSquare^N on a bipartite system CD
Φ:	A pure state of a tripartite system CDE.

Registers:

C:	Alice's quantum system
D:	Bob's quantum system
E:	Eve's side information
$X_1, \ldots, X_N$:	Alice's input registers ($\{1,2,3\}$-valued)
$Y_1, \ldots, Y_N$:	Bob's input registers ($\{1,2,3\}$-valued)
$A_1, \ldots, A_N$:	Alice's output registers ($\{000, 011, 101, 110\}$-valued)
$B_1, \ldots, B_N$:	Bob's output registers ($\{001, 010, 100, 111\}$-valued)
$R_1, \ldots, R_N$:	Alice's key bit register
$S_1, \ldots, S_N$:	Bob's key bit register
$T_1, \ldots, T_N$:	Auxilliary bit registers
F:	A Perm($\{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$)-valued register

Procedure:

1. Prepare CD in state Φ.
2. Choose $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ independently and uniformly at random from $\{1,2,3\}^N$, and set $X := \mathbf{x}$ and $Y := \mathbf{y}$.
3. Measure C with $\{P^{\mathbf{a}}_{\mathbf{x}}\}_{\mathbf{a}}$ and store the result in register A.
4. Measure D with $\{Q^{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathbf{y}}\}_{\mathbf{b}}$ and store the result in register B.
5. For each $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$, set R_i to be equal to the (Y_i)th bit of A_i, and set S_i to be equal to the (X_i)th bit of B_i.
6. For each $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$, if $R_i \neq S_i$, then set T_i to be a independent coin flip. Otherwise, set T_i to 0.
7. Choose a random permutation $\sigma \in \text{Perm}\{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ and apply it to the registers $\{X_i\}, \{A_i\}, \{Y_i\}, \{B_i\}, \{R_i\}, \{S_i\}, \{T_i\}$. Store σ in the register F.

Figure 5: A protocol for generating a shared key.

The Pure Parallel Repetition Process (PureParallel)

Parameters:

N:	A positive integer
G:	An n-player free game with input alphabet $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{X}^n$ and output alphabet $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{A}^n$
$\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(C^1 \otimes \ldots \otimes C^n)$:	A pure n-partite state
$\{M_{\mathbf{a}\|\mathbf{x}} = M^1_{\mathbf{a}\|\mathbf{x}} \otimes \ldots \otimes M^n_{\mathbf{a}\|\mathbf{x}}\}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}}$:	A projective measurement strategy for G^N (where $M^i_{\mathbf{a}\|\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{P}(C^i)$).

Registers:

$\{X^i_k\}$:	Quantum registers (where X^i_k is $\mathcal{X}^i$-valued, $1 \leq i \leq n$, $1 \leq k \leq N$)
$\{X'^i_k\}$:	Quantum registers (where X'^i_k is $\mathcal{X}^i$-valued, $1 \leq i \leq n$, $1 \leq k \leq N$)
$\{A^i_k\}$:	Quantum registers (where A^i_k is $\mathcal{A}^i$-valued, $1 \leq i \leq n$, $1 \leq k \leq N$)
$\{W_k\}$:	Bit registers ($1 \leq k \leq N$)
P :	A Perm($\{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$)-valued quantum register.

Procedure:

1. Prepare the register C in the state Φ. Prepare the registers $\{X^i_k\}$ so that $X^i_k X'^i_k$ is in a Bell state for all k, i.
2. Apply the process from XC to XCA given by the unitary map
$$|\mathbf{x}\rangle |v\rangle \quad \mapsto \quad \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}^{\times N}} |\mathbf{x}\rangle \left|M_{\mathbf{a}|\mathbf{x}} v M_{\mathbf{a}|\mathbf{x}}\right\rangle |\mathbf{a}\rangle .$$
3. Choose a random permutation $\sigma \colon \{1, 2, \ldots, N\} \to \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ and store it in P. Apply the permutation σ to the registers $X_1, \ldots, X_N$, the registers $X'_1, \ldots, X'_N$, and the registers $A_1, \ldots, A_N$.
4. Measure X_1 and A_1, and set $W_1 := L(X_1, A_1)$.
5. Measure X_2 and A_2, and set $W_2 := L(X_2, A_2)$.

$\vdots$

$N + 3$. Measure A_N and X_N, and set $W_N := L(X_N, A_N)$.

Figure 6: A parallel repetition process with entangled inputs and a pure initial state.